

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being submitted *via* the USPTO EFS Filing System; Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents; Commissioner for Patents; P.O. Box 1450; Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: October 9, 2007/Kimberly Webb/
Kimberly Webb**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re patent application of:

Applicant(s): Maneesh Agrawala, *et al.*

Examiner: Jin Cheng Wang

Serial No: 10/775,710

Art Unit: 2628

Filing Date: February 10, 2004

Title: SYSTEMS AND METHODS THAT UTILIZE A DYNAMIC DIGITAL ZOOMING
INTERFACE IN CONNECTION WITH DIGITAL INKING

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

Applicant submits this brief in connection with an appeal of the above-identified patent application. A credit card payment form is filed concurrently herewith in connection with all fees due regarding this appeal brief. In the event any additional fees may be due and/or are not covered by the credit card, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP592US].

I. Real Party in Interest (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(i))

The real party in interest in the present appeal is Microsoft Corporation, the assignee of the present application.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(ii))

Appellants, appellants' legal representative, and/or the assignee of the present application are not aware of any appeals or interferences which may be related to, will directly affect, or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. Status of Claims (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(iii))

Claims 1-20 stand rejected by the Examiner. The rejection of claims 1-20 is being appealed.

IV. Status of Amendments (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(iv))

No amendments to the claims were submitted after the Final Office Action. (*See* Applicants' Reply to Final Office Action dated March 08, 2007).

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(v))**A. Independent Claim 1**

Independent claim 1 recites a system that facilitates free form digital inking, the system is recorded on a computer-readable medium and capable of execution by a computer, comprising: an annotation management component that generates an inking region for a digital document (*See*, page 7, lines 1-2; page 8, lines 10-13); and a navigation component that provides algorithms that enable manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region relative to the digital document, the re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital document (*See*, page 10, lines 18-31).

B. Independent Claim 14

Independent claim 14 recites a computer-implemented method that provides a zoom window to annotate digital documents with digital ink, comprising: generating the zoom

window; scaling contents displayed in the zoom window (*See*, page 13, lines 13-20); providing algorithms that enable manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the zoom window relative to the digital documents, the re-positioning and re-sizing of the zoom window occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital documents; positioning the zoom window over an area of interest; and navigating the zoom window after annotating the document (*See*, page 16, lines 21-30; page 17, lines 1-28).

C. Independent Claim 20

Independent claim 20 recites a system that facilitates electronic document annotating, the system is recorded on a computer-readable medium and capable of execution by a computer, comprising: means for generating an annotation window for an electronic document (*See*, page 16, lines 9-20); means for defining a location of the annotation window means for magnifying contents of the annotation window; means for employing the annotation window to annotate the electronic document; and means for providing algorithms that enable manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the annotation window relative to the electronic document, the re-positioning and re-sizing of the annotation window occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the electronic document (*See*, page 16, lines 21-30; page 17, lines 1-28).

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(vi))

A. Claims 1-20 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed innovation is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

B. Claims 1-20 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

C. Claims 1, 2, 4-16 and 18-20 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Price *et al.* (2001/0043716).

D. Claims 3 and 17 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Price *et al.* (2001/0043716) in view of N.O. Bouvin *et al.* “Fluid Annotations Through Open Hypermedia:

Using and Extending Emerging Web Standards”.

E. Claims 1, 2, 4-16, and 18-20 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Marshall *et al.* (2003/0070139) in view of Nagae (6,230,169).

F. Claims 3 and 17 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Marshall *et al.* (2003/0070139) in view of N.O. Bouvin *et al.* “Fluid Annotations Through Open Hypermedia: Using and Extending Emerging Web Standards”.

VII. Argument (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(vii))

A. Rejection of Claims 1-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed innovation is directed to non-statutory subject matter. It is respectfully requested that rejection of these claims be reversed for at least the following reasons:

Independent claim 1 recites a “system that facilitates free form digital inking, *the system is recorded on a computer-readable medium and capable of execution by a computer*, comprising: an annotation management...*generates* an inking region...; and a navigation component ...enable manual and *automatic re-positioning and re-sizing* of the inking region...” Similar limitations of “*a computer-implemented method* that provides a zoom window to annotate digital documents ...comprising: *generating* the zoom window; *scaling* contents displayed in the zoom window; providing algorithms that enable manual and *automatic re-positioning and re-sizing* of the zoom....,” and “a system that facilitates electronic document annotating, the *system is recorded on a computer-readable medium and capable of execution by a computer*, comprising: means for *generating* an annotation window ...means for *magnifying* contents of the annotation window....means for providing algorithms that enable manual and automatic *re-positioning and re-sizing* of the annotation window....,” are recited in independent claims 14 and 20 respectively.

In the Final Office Action (dated May 08, 2007), the Examiner argues that claim 1 applies a computer program in the form of a seemingly patentable apparatus or system. As stated in the Reply to Final Office Action, and is reiterated herein the claims includes *functional*

descriptive material, rendering it structurally and functionally interrelated to a computer processor, and therefore the subject claims are directed to statutory subject matter. In addition, the examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" issued on October 26, 2005. Annex IV of the guidelines is particularly instructive. Annex IV explains that "'functional descriptive material' consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component." As also explained in Annex IV, "[w]hen functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized."

Furthermore, independent claims 1, 14 and 20 (and claims which depend there from) recite statutory subject matter as they produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result such to be classified as patentable subject matter according to 35 U.S.C. §101.

Because the claimed process applies the Boolean principle [abstract idea] **to produce a useful, concrete, tangible result** ... on its face the claimed process comfortably falls within the scope of §101. *AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc.*, 172 F.3d 1352, 1358. (Fed.Cir. 1999) (Emphasis added); *See State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Fin. Group, Inc.*, 149 F.3d 1368, 1373, 47 USPQ2d 1596, 1601 (Fed.Cir.1998). The inquiry into patentability requires an examination of the contested claims to see if the claimed subject matter, as a whole, is a disembodied mathematical concept representing nothing more than a "law of nature" or an "abstract idea," or if the mathematical concept has been **reduced to some practical application rendering it "useful."** *AT&T* at 1357 citing *In re Alappat*, 33 F.3d 1526, 31 1544, 31 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1545, 1557 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (Emphasis added) (holding that more than an abstract idea was claimed because the claimed invention as a whole was directed toward forming a specific machine that produced the useful, concrete, and tangible result of a smooth waveform display).

The claimed invention, for example, can facilitate the practical application of **free form digital inking**. More particularly, the claimed invention relates to a system comprising of a various components (annotation management component and navigation component) that perform the function of "*generating an inking region*", and "*re-positioning and re-sizing of the*

inking region relative to the digital document” to facilitate the practical application of *free form digital inking* to produce a *useful, concrete, and tangible result* of annotating electronic documents.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that the claimed invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result pursuant to *AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc.* Accordingly, this rejection should be reversed.

B. Rejection of Claims 1-20 Under 35 U.S.C §112

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Reversal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. The subject claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicants regard as the invention.

Independent claim 1, in part, recites “a system that facilitates free form digital inking, the system is recorded on a computer-readable medium and capable of execution by a computer, comprising: an annotation management component that generates an inking region for a digital document.” To this end, the Specification discloses the following:

The present invention provides systems and methods that facilitate *annotating digital documents* (e.g., word processing documents, images, etc.)... (See, page 7, lines 1-2).

FIG. 1 illustrates a system 100 that facilitates *digital inking*. The system 100 comprises an *annotation management component* 110 that *generates inking*, or *annotation regions* and an input component 120 that conveys requests for inking regions to the annotation management component 110. (See, page 8, lines 10-13).

Independent claim 1 further recites “a navigation component that provides algorithms that enable manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region relative to the digital document, the re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital document.” Accordingly, the Specification discloses the following:

The navigation component 230 provides algorithms that enable *manual and/or automatic re-positioning and/or re-sizing relative to the document* in order to allow the user to add annotations essentially anywhere on the document. *Such re-positioning and/or re-sizing can occur prior to, concurrently with or after annotating*; thus, the present invention provides for multi-scale navigation before, during and after annotating. The *algorithms are based on a space-scale framework and include a create space, a move inking region, and a move document algorithm*. The space-scale framework is based on geometric relationships between the inking region and the document being annotated.

The *create space algorithm automatically re-sizes and re-positions the inking region as the user annotates the document*. Typically, the *inking region automatically changes shape to create space as the user annotates near the edge of the inking region*. This can be achieved by extending the inking region while fixing a mapping between a source plane and a zoom plane and by moving the inking region center to a new center, wherein the inking region remains under the pen, but provides more space to continue annotating. (See, page 10, lines 18-31).

In the Final Office Action (dated May 08, 2007), the Examiner argues that the Applicant speculates the claim limitation “ manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region relative to the digital document, the re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital document.” Applicants’ representative respectfully disagrees. From the foregoing excerpts of the Specification, it is readily apparent that the Specification clearly describes an annotation management component that generates an inking region for a digital document, and a navigation component that provides algorithms that enable manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region relative to the digital document, the re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital document, as claimed. Therefore, a person having ordinary skill in the art could reasonably interpret the claimed subject matter in light of the specification.

In the Advisory Action (dated July 25, 2007), the Examiner argues that the applicant misinterprets the disclosure and that the “Specification is vague and ambiguous and applicant import the vague and ambiguous language into the claims such as the claim 1.” The Examiner

further argues that applicants' disclosure refers to "annotating" and "re-positioning and re-sizing" with respect to plurality of inking regions, while the claimed subject matter recites a single inking region, and concludes that the re-sizing and re-positioning cannot occur prior to annotating a single inking region. Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees as the Examiner not only misinterprets the applicants' disclosure but misconstrues the claimed subject matter and concludes that annotation cannot occur prior to inking region. The Examiner is reminded that the claimed subject matter relates to generating an inking region for annotating digital documents, and that the generated inking region (that is used for annotation) can be re-positioned and re-sized relative to the digital document, wherein the re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region (that is used for annotation) occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital document. To this end, the Specification discloses the following:

...the *inking region* can be manually and/or automatically *re-positioned and/or re-sized* relative to the document to enable the user to add annotations essentially anywhere on the document. Such changes to the *inking region* can *occur prior to, concurrently with and/or after annotating*. (See, page 9, lines 9-13).

From the foregoing excerpts of the Specification, it is readily apparent that the claim(s) contain subject matter that is clearly described in the Specification. Therefore, a person having ordinary skill in the art could reasonably interpret the claimed subject matter in light of the specification.

Furthermore, in the Final Office Action (dated May 8, 2007), the Examiner argues that the Specification (on page 20) teaches "a fixed zoom window", and that "the zoom window corresponds to the document information, which is fixed *after* the annotation was made". As stated in the Reply to Final Office Action (dated May 08, 2007), the Examiner incorrectly concludes that the Specification teaches a "fixed zoomed window." For example, the Specification discloses the following:

... FIG. 9, an exemplary navigation methodology 900 (and corresponding space-scale diagram) *that moves a zoom window relative to a document during annotation*...

...as the *user drags the zoom window, the zoom center, source center and source origin are concurrently translated*, which ensures that a user can zoom any point in the underlying document as the zoom window is dragged from location to location. (See, page 16, lines 21-30, and page 17, lines 1-8).

FIG. 10 illustrates an exemplary navigation methodology 1000 (and corresponding space-scale diagram) *that moves a document being annotated relative a zoom window*... This approach changes the portion of the document that is within the zoom window rather than moving the zoom window. (See, page 17, lines 8-21).

FIG. 11 illustrates an exemplary navigation methodology 1100 (and corresponding space-scale diagram) *that automatically re-sizes and positions a zoom window as a user annotates a document*... the zoom window *automatically changes shape to create space as the user annotates near the edge of the zoom window*. (See, page 17, lines 22-28).

From the foregoing excerpts of the Specification, it is readily apparent that the Specification clearly teaches different annotation window location and navigation methodologies, including moving the zoom window relative to the document during annotation, fixing the zoom window and moving the document being annotated, and automatically changing shapes (re-sizing and re-positioning) to create space as the user annotates the document. This clearly shows that the Examiner interpretation of the Specification teaching a “fixed zoom window” is incorrect.

Based on at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that the claim(s) contain subject matter which is reasonably described in the Specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be reversed with respect to claims 1-20.

C. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-16 and 18-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4-16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Price et al. (2001/0043716). Reversal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the

following reasons. Price et al. fails to disclose or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that ***“each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.”*** *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (quoting *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Independent claim 1 recites a system that facilitates free form digital inking, the system is recorded on a computer-readable medium and capable of execution by a computer, comprising: an annotation management component that generates *an inking region for a digital document*; and a navigation component that provides algorithms that enable *manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region* relative to the digital document, the *re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital document*. Similar limitation of “method that provides a *zoom window to annotate digital documents... generating the zoom window... manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the zoom window* relative to the digital documents... *re-positioning and re-sizing of the zoom window occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital documents*,” and “means for generating an *annotation window* for an electronic document... means for... and *automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the annotation window* relative to the electronic document, the *re-positioning and re-sizing of the annotation window occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the electronic document*,” are recited in independent claims 14 and 20 respectively. Price et al. fails to disclose or suggest each and every aspect of the claimed invention.

Price et al. relates generally to a system and a method that enables free-form digital ink annotation of data traces and storage management of the data trace based upon the free-form digital ink annotations. More specifically, Price et al., teaches a system that can *automatically select regions in the data trace based upon the position of the annotation and automatically summarize the data traces, and manage the storage of the data of a data trace based upon the freeform digital ink annotations*. For example, Price et al. discloses a display (item 50) of an annotated data trace (seismogram, item 52). The data trace (item 52) is annotated at 56, 58, 60,

and 62. (See, Fig. 2A). Price *et al.* teaches a system that designates data traces corresponding to free-form digital ink annotations and presents a summary (See, Fig. 2B) of the data trace and manages the storage of the data trace underlying the data trace in accordance with the free-form digital ink annotations. *The summary only shows the data traces that correspond to freeform digital ink annotations.* Similarly, Fig. 3B is a summary of the audio data trace of Fig. 3A.

In the Final Office Action (dated May 08, 2007), the Examiner argues that Price *et al.* teaches a system comprising of “an annotation management component that generates an inking region for a digital document (See Figs. 2A-2B and 3A-3B wherein at least an inking region in Fig. 3B is generated and zoomed; see also Paragraph 0033 for zooming/scaling of the inking region)”. Appellants’ representative respectfully disagrees. The Examiner interprets the display of the summary of the data traces corresponding to the free-form digital ink annotations (Price *et al.*, Fig. 3B) with the zoomable inking region of the claimed invention. As stated in the Reply to Final Office Action, and is reiterated herein, *selectively summarizing a particular data trace (corresponding to the free form digital ink annotations) and displaying the summarized data trace is not the same as generating an inking region, for annotating a digital document, which can be manually and/or automatically re-positioned or re-sized relative to the digital document.*

Further, the Examiner argues that Price *et al.* teaches a navigation component (Figs. 1, 6A-6B and 7-9; Paragraph 0044-0046) that provides algorithms that enable manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region relative to the digital document, the re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital document. At the indicated passages, Price *et al.*, merely teaches a flow chart (with various steps involved) outlining a control routine to ***summarize the data trace***. For example, the flow chart (See Fig. 8), teaches various steps, including generating empty list of time ranges, adding time ranges, determining whether there are more annotations, sorting the time range, and so on to ***return a display of a the summary of the data trace that correspond to free-form digital ink annotations***. Nowhere does Price *et al.* disclose or suggest *manual and/or automatic re-positioning and/or re-sizing of the inking region relative to the digital document* in order to allow the user to add annotations, wherein *such re-positioning and/or re-sizing can occur prior to, concurrently with or after annotating*. Accordingly, Price *et al.*, fails to disclose or suggest a system that facilitates free form digital inking, comprising of ***a navigation component that provides algorithms that enable manual and automatic re-positioning and re-***

sizing of the inking region relative to the digital document, the re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital document.

For at least the above reasons, the rejection of independent claims 1, 14 and 20 (and claims which depend there from) should be reversed.

D. Rejection of Claims 3 and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Price *et al.* (2001/0043716) in view of N.O. Bouvin *et al.* “Fluid Annotations Through Open Hypermedia: Using and Extending Emerging Web Standards”. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be reversed for the following reasons. Price *et al.*, and Bouvin *et al.*, taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest every element of the claimed invention.

Bouvin *et al.* merely relates to annotation techniques based on animated typographical changes that can help readers utilize annotations more effectively. Bouvin *et al.* is completely silent about manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of an inking region relative to the digital document, wherein the re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital document, as recited in the subject claims. In particular, Bouvin *et al.* does not make up for aforementioned deficiencies of Price *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1 and 14 (which claims 3 and 17 depend respectively there from). Thus, the claimed invention as recited in claims 3 and 17 is not obvious over the combination of Price *et al.* and Bouvin *et al.* Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be reversed.

E. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-16, and 18-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4-16, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall *et al.* (2003/0070139) in view of Nagae *et al.* (6,230,169). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be reversed for at least the following reasons. Marshall *et al.* and Nagae *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims.

Marshall *et al.* discloses systems and methods that detect and emphasize high-value free form annotations. The particular annotation style used by a particular user to create the annotations in a document is determined. This annotation style can be individual or a

standardized style. Once the annotation style is determined, such that high-value annotation marks can be distinguished from low-value annotation marks, the annotations within the document are analyzed to locate the high-value annotation marks. (See page 1, paragraphs [0011]-[0014]). However, Marshall *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter.

In the Final Office Action (dated May 08, 2007), the Examiner concedes that Marshall *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest an annotation window for freeform annotation using digital inking and offers Nagae *et al.* to cure this deficiency.

Nagae *et al.* merely discloses prompting a user to enter an annotation on a window with a coordinate input device, such as a table, reduce or enlarge the display image of the window with a specified magnification, and then display the window again. Nagae *et al.* teaches that the annotation input window is ***fixed in size*** and that the user can enlarge or reduce the size of the window once displayed on the screen. (See, column 6, line 67, and column 7, lines 1-5). On the other hand, the claimed invention relates to a system that provides manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region relative to the digital document, *the re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital document*. For example, *the inking region automatically changes shape to create space as the user annotates near the edge of the inking region*. Nagae *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest such automatic re-positioning and/or re-sizing relative to the document.

Based on at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that the claimed invention as recited in independent claims 1, 14, and 20 (and claims which depend there from) is not obvious over the combination of Marshall *et al.* and Nagae *et al.* Thus, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be reversed.

F. Rejection of Claims 3 and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall *et al.* (2003/0070139) in view of N.O. Bouvin *et al.* “Fluid Annotations Through Open Hypermedia: Using and Extending Emerging Web Standards”. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be reversed for the following reasons. Marshall *et al.*, and Bouvin *et al.*, taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest every element of the claimed invention. In particular, Bouvin *et al.* does not make up for aforementioned deficiencies of Marshall *et al.* with

respect to independent claims 1 and 14 (which claims 3 and 17 depend respectively there from). Thus, the claimed subject matter as recited in claims 3 and 17 is not obvious over the combination of Marshall *et al.*, and Bouvin *et al.* Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be reversed.

G. Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1-20 be reversed.

If any additional fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP592US].

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24th Floor, National City Center
1900 East 9th Street
Telephone: (216) 696-8730
Facsimile: (216) 696-8731

VIII. Claims Appendix (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(viii))

1. A system that facilitates free form digital inking, the system is recorded on a computer-readable medium and capable of execution by a computer, comprising:

an annotation management component that generates an inking region for a digital document; and

a navigation component that provides algorithms that enable manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region relative to the digital document, the re-positioning and re-sizing of the inking region occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital document.

2. The system of claim 1, wherein the annotation management component is invoked to generate the inking region by identifying a point of interest on the digital document by at least one of a manual and an automatic technique.

3. The system of claim 1, wherein the inking region is generated in connection with animation that makes it appear the inking region grows out of the digital document.

4. The system of claim 1, wherein the inking region is generated to cover a subset of the digital document such that the remaining document can be concurrently viewed.

5. The system of claim 1, wherein the inking region magnifies the portion of the digital document within the inking region.

6. The system of claim 5, wherein the magnification factor is defined such that the user inks at a similar size to document information.

7. The system of claim 1, wherein the inking region is closed *via* one of a digital pen, a mouse, a button and voice activation.

8. The system of claim 1, wherein inking within the inking region scales down to a size similar to the text within the digital document when the inking region is closed.
9. The system of claim 1, wherein the navigation component employs one or more of a move inking region, a move digital document and a create space technique to navigate through the digital document.
10. The system of claim 9, wherein the move inking region, move digital document and create space techniques are based on a space-scale framework.
11. The system of claim 10, wherein the space-scale framework defines navigation *via* the following equation: $Z_C = O(1 - \alpha) + S_C\alpha$, wherein Z_C is a zoom center, O is a zoom origin, α is a scaling factor, and S_C is a screen center.
12. The system of claim 11, wherein the scaling factor is defined by: $\alpha = |Z| / |S|$, wherein $|Z|$ is an absolute value of a zoom region and $|S|$ is an absolute value of a source window.
13. The system of claim 1, wherein an orientation of the inking region is determined *via* moving a digital pen across the document in one of a right-to-left, a left-to-right, a top-to-bottom, and a bottom-to-top manner.
14. A computer-implemented method that provides a zoom window to annotate digital documents with digital ink, comprising:
 - generating the zoom window;
 - scaling contents displayed in the zoom window;
 - providing algorithms that enable manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the zoom window relative to the digital documents, the re-positioning and re-sizing of the zoom window occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the digital documents;
 - positioning the zoom window over an area of interest; and
 - navigating the zoom window after annotating the document.

15. The method of claim 14 further comprising scaling down the document contents and the annotations displayed in the zoom window to a size in line with the text in the document being annotated.

16. The method of claim 14 further comprising defining a shape and a location of the zoom window *via* indicating a point in the document with at least one of a digital pen, a button, a mouse and voice activation.

17. The method of claim 14 further comprising animating generation of the zoom window to create an appearance that the zoom window grows out of the document.

18. The method of claim 14 further comprising employing a space-scale technique to navigate the zoom window.

19. The method of claim 14 further comprising magnifying the zoom window such that the user can add annotations that are similar in size to the document information displayed within the zoom window.

20. A system that facilitates electronic document annotating, the system is recorded on a computer-readable medium and capable of execution by a computer, comprising:

- means for generating an annotation window for an electronic document;
- means for defining a location of the annotation window
- means for magnifying contents of the annotation window;
- means for employing the annotation window to annotate the electronic document; and
- means for providing algorithms that enable manual and automatic re-positioning and re-sizing of the annotation window relative to the electronic document, the re-positioning and re-sizing of the annotation window occurs prior to, concurrently with and after a user annotates the electronic document.

IX. Evidence Appendix (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(ix))

None.

X. Related Proceedings Appendix (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(x))

None.